Item	Description
Name/Title	General Education Review Committee
Date	April 15, 2015
Time	11:00-noon
Location	200 McKenny
Members Attending	Zenia Bahorski, Doug Baker, Chris Foreman (co-chair), Christopher Gardiner, Lisa Klopfer, John Koolage (co-chair), Konnie Kustron, Peggy Liggit, Gerald Newberry, Bob Winning
Absent	Mary Rearick (excused)

Meeting Notes

Discussion of the draft final report continued.

<u>Technology Discussion:</u>

There was extensive discussion of the technology piece in light of the latest revisions to the draft. Discussion included the following:

Points included with regard to revisions:
- Position supported by standards set forth by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).
- In line with Faculty Senate, "Executive Summary of Suggestion of Science/Technology Improvements to Proposed General Education Requirements" (2004).
- Suggestion of recommendation that a minority position with respect to the current revisions be included in the final report.

Discussion of revisions:
- Concern that these revisions came so late in the process:
  - A collaborative solution could have been worked on if the revisions had come earlier.
  - Technology discussion started late in the process. There is no subcommittee on technology.
- Conflict with committee's charge:
  - While the technology argument is important and should be included in the final report, these revisions read more like lobbying.
  - While the committee's review has revealed something important that's missing, the job of the committee is not to fix it, but to make recommendations towards a solution.
- Structure of final report:
  - Technology piece should be included, but does not need to appear throughout the report.
  - Distinction between noticing a problem exists and making a recommendation. Need to spell out what the problem is before jumping to what we think we want.
- Supporting research:
  - AAC&U is not changing learning outcomes and discusses information literacy rather than tech requirement.
  - Of the schools benchmarked in the committee's review, eleven of fifteen say there isn't a standalone tech component.
- STEM:
  - STEM isn't just technology. There is compliance with science and math. There is a bias toward the natural sciences.

- o Digital literacy can cover a wide range of things. We need to define what the report means by digital skills. Another position is that the term digital literacy is outdated. While it is the correct term, it is not what the research is saying.
- Substantial changes suggested to Criterion One (Mission):
  - o If we are now going to say what EMU is or isn't doing in this portion of the report, then this criterion is part of a SWOT analysis and would need to be completely revised.
    - ▪ The template used for the report does not structure this criterion as such an analysis.
    - ▪ The criterion is not designed to have recommendations.
  - o The mission criterion is not the place for this discussion. It should be included in more appropriate sections of report.
  - o Legitimate to include lack of tech requirement in 1.3 with regard to how national criteria (including AAC&U) for General Education might be appropriate for supporting the program's education goals.
- Revisions appropriate to Criterion Three (Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support): The new material seems most to most naturally belong here.
- Use of appendix:
  - o Weakness is that it doesn't go directly in the report.
  - o Appendix is part of the report. This strategy means the information is in the place it needs to be. The revisions will be part of the Criterion Three SWOT analysis and if there is more to say than can be included in this type of analysis, then it needs to go in an appendix and not disrupt the purpose of the overall document.
- General Education courses as part of major:
  - o Many General Education programs focus on the exploratory aspect of the program and don't allow for courses in the major to meet program requirements.
  - o In some schools introductory courses aren't even part of a major.
  - o This is issue not yet addressed that will be added to the list.

Discussion Outcomes:
- In light of the discussion, the following options were identified:
  - o Edit Criteria One (1.3) and Three as discussed to include the revisions.
  - o Appendix I will include the detailed information.
  - o Include one or two possible ways of addressing the problem and task a committee with working on it.
    - ▪ That committee could look at possibility of building a super-structure comparable to the Writing Intensive one.
    - ▪ Committee may not be in unity as to course of action, but could at least lay out two alternative recommendations. This is preferable to dissenting opinion option.

Action Items:

Draft revision:
- Zenia, Konnie, Bob, and Lisa will work on integrating the tech revisions into Criterion Three.
- Chris Gardiner will revise Criterion One (1.3) as discussed. More work to be done on what the AAC&U says.
- Recommendations that cut across criteria will be included in recommendation section. Individual recommendations will be left in their own sections.
- Executive Summary draft will be available shortly.
- Peggy will work on adding language to Criterion Four (4.3) to reference the data from the Quantitative Review Subcommittee contained in an appendix.

- Look at including the fact that math has an entering criteria and writing does not into 3.3 or 3.6.
- Check for consistent language: e.g. spelling out EMU and Gen Ed.
- All revisions to be distributed to the committee for feedback. When complete, the final revisions to be sent to Doug.

Timeline:
- Revisions to Doug prior to noon on April 21st.
- Final meeting on April 22nd.
- Final draft complete by April 28th
- Report goes to Provost's Office by April 30th.
- Committee dissolves at semester end.
- Final Report will be held by Associate Provost for faculty input at the launch of fall semester.